



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—NOTES ON LATIN SYNTAX.

The following notes owe their origin to a book, rich not only in valuable information regarding *proprietas splendorque verborum*, but in problems of interest to the student of syntax, the Schmalz-Krebs' *Antibarbarus*.¹ In a book of so vast a scope and so full of suggestiveness, containing the results of the most recent investigations, enriched by the fruits of the extended labors of one long recognized as *peritissimus linguae Latinae*, many statements would naturally arouse discussion. I limit myself, however, to the following.

Ac before Gutturals: the fact that three writers, Varro, Livy, and Plin. Mai., are conspicuous for the frequency with which they use *ac* in this position is to be emphasized.² The style of Plin. Mai. is also conspicuous for the number of times he uses *atque non*, 27 in all,³ a fact all the more remarkable when it is taken into consideration that he uses the regular *ac non* only 4 times (2, 162; 7, 7; 18, 245; 31, 97). According to both Schmalz Synt.³, § 224 and the Thesaurus, Col. 1075, '*atque non* is only found in Plin. Nat'. Note, however, its use in Plaut. Trin. 104 (G. and Sch., and Lindsay), Varro, L. L. 6, 38 (Spengel), Gell. 17, 21, 46 (Hosius) and Auson., Ad Grat. Ep., l. 8 (P., p. 353). Cf. *neque non* Livy 24, 2, 4; Gell. 13, 11, 6; 17, 10, 17. Theoretically such forms ought not to occur at all.⁴

¹ The Seventh Edition (1905-8), Vol. I, pp. viii-811, Vol. II, 776, shows an increase of 136 pages, 131 new articles: "*Redditus auctori debitus honor*",—"Applause, in spite of trivial faults, is due". For the writer's reviews of Vol. I, see Class. Rev. 20 (1906) pp. 218-222, and A. J. P. XXVIII (1907), pp. 34-55.

² *Ac* before *c*: in Varro (L. L., R. R.) 43, Livy 48, Plin. Mai. 37. The Thesaurus omits under *c*: Ovid. Met. 15, 398, Sen. N. Q. 1, pr. 11 (G.); Mela 1, 2, Quint. 10, 1, 47, Apul. Met., pp. 22, 13; 218, 29; 278, 7; 282, 18 (Helm); under *g*: Lucr. 6, 440, Celsus, p. 126, 4 (D.), Plin. Mai. 2, 135, 18, 81, Sen. Ep. 88, 9, Just. 7, 3, 4, Suet. Cal. 17, 2, Oros. 1, pr. 16; under *q*: Plin. Mai. 2, 200; 206; 10, 157; 18, 95; 33, 29, Val. Fl. 7, 267.

³ *Atque non*: the Thesaurus omits for Pliny: 2, 92; 12, 97; 17, 91; 20, 57; 32, 60; 36, 198; 37, 42; 115, cites 7, 7 = *ac non* (M.), and does not note the contrasted use of *ac non*.

⁴ Cf. Niedermann-Hermann, Hist. Laut. des. Lat. (1907), § 32.

From the point of view of the history of *ac* as contrasted with *atque*, it is important to note that there is a regular increase in the use of the shorter form from 28.4 % in Sallust to 74.3 % in Suetonius.¹

Cum praesertim: a collocation non-existent, according to some writers. See, however, Antib⁷. II, p. 364 and Nägelsbach-M., Stil⁹, p. 742, and add to their lists: Sall. Cat. 51, 19; Cic. S. Rosc. 66, Inv. 1, 5, Brut. 3, Or. 32, Off. 2, 56, Fam. 2, 6, 2; 3, 5, 3; 10, 10; 5, 20, 4; Att. 8, 11 (D.), 3; 14, 1; 10, 10, 2; 13, 2; 11, 11, 1; 12, 25, 1; Livy 32, 20, 6; Val. Max. 2, 10, 6; 6, 1, 4; Celsus, pp. 76, 29; 317, 15 (D.), Quint. 2, 21, 13; 7, 1, 62; 8, 6, 74; 10, 1, 105, Apul. Met. 7, 9 (p. 161, 4 Helm).

Diffidens with the ablative: according to the Antib⁷, 'found in Silver Latin only in Suet. Caes. 3'; note, however, its use in Front. Str. 1, 8, 5 (G.) *paucitate suorum diffidens*.

Dignus with the infinitive: to Draeger II², p. 332 and the Antib⁷. add: Sen. N. Q. 6, 30, 5; Ep. 89, 5, Mela 1, 1; 75, Gell. 15, 18, 1, and to the 7 passages cited for Ovid by Kübler (Progr. K. W. Gymn. Berl., 1861, p. 8) add: Her. 17, 102; Met. 10, 336; 14, 833; Trist. 2, 242; 3, 4, 34; Fast. 1, 1, 226; 3, 490. See further A. J. P. XXVIII, p. 41 f. and add, with *ut*: Quint. Decl. 263 (p. 76, 26, R.), Script. Hist. Aug. 23, 21, 2. According to Schmalz, Synt³, § 86 and Antib⁷, *dignus* with the dative is not found until Late Latin. Cf., however, Stat. Silv. 4, 6, 59.

Excedere, with *modum*: Val. Max. 4, 3, 5, Sen. Ep. 45, 13, Plin. Min. 2, 4, 4; 5, 13; 3, 11, 8; 7, 33, 10; 8, 24, 10; with *tempus* Val. Max. 5, 4, 3, *circuitum* Mela 2, 97, *alvum* Plin. Min. 8, 7, 1, *annum* 2, 3, 5, *crimina* 2, 11, 2, *licentiam* 3, 20, 3, *numerus* Trai. Ep. 95, *naturam* Macr. 1, 23, 1, *fidem* Sen. Ep. 97, 3.

Igitur first in the sentence: its marked frequency in Celsus, Justin, and Orosius, is a striking feature of the style of each (in Celsus 34 times, postponed 3, in Apul. (Met., Apol.), 23 times, postponed 5, in Oros. 70, postponed 12).²

Itaque: its use in the following writers is striking: Celsus, following the Class. usage places it first 20 times, postpones it 6,

¹ Cf. Lease, Class. Phil. 3 (1908), p. 304.

² Neue-W. Formenlehre II³, p. 975 shows a very faulty treatment of this word: in e.g., Val. Max. 16 passages are omitted, in Plin. Min. 19, in Justin 74, in Curtius 49, in Suet. 5, and in Orosius 70. See further, Lease A. J. P. XXVIII (1907), p. 48.

and Orosius, first 42 times, postponed 15, but in Apul. Met. (Helm) it is placed first only once (p. 10, 12), and postponed 20 times. See further Lease, A. J. P. XXVIII (1907), p. 48.¹

Loci: according to the Antib.¹ *interea loci* is found only in Plaut. and Ter., but cf. Pacuv. Chrys. 1 (R. 1897). Lorenz to Pseud. 255 is a better reference than Reisig-H. Anm. 530.

Longe with a Comparative: an important treatment is found in Wölfflin, Comp. p. 41, though the lists there given might well be extended.² For Plautus cf. Lorenz to Most. 911.

Merere ut: the Antib.¹ says this usage is found only once in Livy, 28, 19, 6, but it is also found in two other passages, 7, 21, 6 and 40, 11, 6. It is also found more than once in Cicero; cf. Fin. 2, 74; Verr. 4, 135. *Merere* with infin.: to Draeger II², p. 331 add Eutrop. 9, 15, 2; 10, 8, 2.

Metuere with dative: note its use of things in Livy 3, 49, 5 (vitae), 23, 16, 3 (castris) and of persons in 1, 9, 6 (sibi). Note also: *huic puero metuit*, Cic. Sulla 88. For its use with the infin., cf. Draeger II², p. 342 and add Ovid, Met. 1, 745.

Miscere: to this word the Antib.¹ devotes but four lines and does not note its use with the dative or with *cum*.³ To the

¹Neue II³, p. 976, cites Liv. 22, 24 8 (= utique), Curt. 7, 10, 7 (wrong reference) and omits: Plin. Mai. 2, 129; 193; 5, 98; 8, 176; 11, 64, Mart. 8 pr., Suet. Tib. 11, 3, Cae. 37, 3; 48, 1, Claud. 11, 1, Vit. 5, Prat. 147 (R.), Front. Str. 1, 1, 1; 6; 2, 9, 10; 3, 1, 1.

²Add to a) with *regular comp.*, Livy 39, 31, 7, Sen. Suas. 2, 14, Contr. 2, 6, 12, Val. Max. 1, 7 ext. 3, Celsus, p. 77, 11 (D.), Sen. N. Q. 1, 5, 2; 6, 6; 2, 32, 1; 5, 5, 1; Quint. 6, 3, 13; 4, 21; 10, 1, 67 (bis), Plin. Min. 1, 14, 10; 8, 24, 6; 10, 39, 4, Apul. Met., p. 216, 14 (Helm), Gell. 13, 29, 3; 17, 21, 9, Veget., p. 35, 8; 108, 20 (L.), Macr. 3, 5, 9, Oros. 3, 13, 11, and to b) with *irreg. comp.* Livy 24, 28, 5; 37, 52, 10; 40, 6, 7, Val. Max. 5, 2, 7; 6, 3, 9; 8, 1 Absol. 12, Sen. Contr. 7, 1, 25; 2, 27, Sen. N. Q. 1, 6, 5; 16, 2, Plin. Mai. 24, 109, Plin. Min. 2, 3, 10; 8, 14, 24; 18, 1, Just. 3, 7, 6; 6, 2, 14; 9, 3, 9, Front. Str. 2, 3, 12; 5, 9, Apul. Met., p. 228, 14 (Helm), Gell. 13, 20, 3, Veget., p. 108, 10; 130, 17; 153, 14 (L.) and Oros. 7, 35, 2.

³Livy's usage is as follows:

I MISCERE.

A. *Things*, 1) Simple ablative: here the form shows 10 uses (1, 29, 2; 8, 36, 5; 9, 38, 6, and with *mixtus* 2, 33, 8; 10, 16, 3; 21, 56, 6; 22, 1, 10; 26, 11, 2; 39, 42, 5; 40, 8, 3). With these are to be reckoned, also with *mixtus*, *fumo* 4, 33, 8, *vento* 21, 58, 3 (cf. *grandine* 26, 11, 2 and Lucr. 6, 159, Ovid Fast. 4, 625, Verg. Aen. 12, 838, Val. Max. 1, 6, 5 and *Vapore* Lucr. 2, 223), and, after the analogy of *metu* 39, 42, 5 (cf. Ovid Tr. 4, 3, 12) also *gaudio* 39, 21, 1. Here, too, probably belong *falsa mixta veris* 24, 30, 3 and *aequa iniquis miscet* 35, 17, 2. Cf. *mixta cum veris* Ovid, Met. 12, 54.

"literature" cited by Schmalz add: cf. Bennett, Trans. Am. Phil. Assn. 36 (1905), p. 71 f.

Multum with a *Comparative* (cf. *πολὺ μείζον*); to Schmalz Synt³, § 88 add: Sil. Ital. 13, 708, Stat. Theb. 9, 559, Quint. 10, 1, 94, Juv. 10, 197; 12, 66. Cf. *aliquantum taetriore* Val. Max. 5, 9, 3. Cf. also Weiss.-M. to Livy³ 40, 40, 1.

2) Abl. with *cum*: 9, 22, 10 *cum dolore* (contrast *metu* 39, 42, 5 and *dolori* Sen. Ep. 99, 27), *cum insectatione* 40, 12, 6 *cum rebus Romanis* 45, 14, 3 (note *cum elocutione* Quint. 6, 5, 11, and contrast *cum verbis* Ovid Her. 10, 38 with *verbis* Id. A. A. 1, 663; note also *cum bonis tuis* Sall. Hist. 4, 69, 2 (M.), *cum meis lacrimis* Ovid, Pont. 1, 9, 20, and the frequent use of *cum* with things in Celsus). In Livy 1, 9, 4 *cum hominibus* is found, by brachylogy, = *cum sanguine hominum* (cf. Ovid Met. 12, 256 *cum sanguine*).

3) Dative belongs chiefly to poetry and post-classical prose (as shown by the form, e. g., in Val. Max. 2, 3, 2, Sen. Ep. 104, 12, Plin. Mai. 5, 75; 17, 119; 33, 132; 34, 168; with *misceri* Sen. Ben. 6, 6, 1, Ep. 7, 2; 97, 27, Plin. Mai. 2, 222; 18, 206; 19, 156; 24, 3; 72; with *mixtus* Sen. Ep. 66, 17, Plin. Mai. 22, 101; 24, 4; 43; 186; 29, 122; 30, 75; 36, 133). Livy shows but one possible example, 5, 37, 7 *Tiberino amni miscetur* (cf. *mixtum flumini* Curt. 9, 97).

B. *Persons*: here the form shows but one example, 24, 31, 3 *miscendi eos agmini*. Parallel to this is *hostibus* 4, 34, 1 (cf. *μίσγεται ἀνδρεσσιν*), *legionibus* 10, 31, 12 and here is to be enrolled also, *Romanis* 23, 4, 7, *patribus* 27, 51, 5, *feminis* 39, 8, 6, *nobis* 39, 37, 7, and *vobis* 4, 5, 5.

II COMPOUNDS OF MISCERE.

Admiscere: only 6, 40, 12 *vitali* (cibo), probably a dative (the form shows a dative in Sen. Ep. 66, 16, with *admixtus* in Plin. Mai. 27, 97; 28, 75; 29, 51; 36, 133).

Immiscere: according to the form, only six in the dative: *turbæ* 3, 50, 10; 8, 24, 15; 22, 60, 2; 23, 23, 7, *turmae* 10, 28, 7, *equiti* 26, 4, 10; but to this category probably also belong 5, 8, 6; 9, 36, 4; 39, 31, 8. With the passive, however, the dative is used 14 times, 7 being with *immixtus* (to the Antib⁷ add: 21, 32, 7; 24, 3, 12; 27, 18, 12; 29, 28, 3; 30, 33, 12; 37, 39, 9; 40, 12, and for Plin. Nat.: 17, 25; 19, 155).

Two passages deserve particular attention on account of textual or syntactical difficulties. In 29, 28, 3 the text, without variants, is *hominum turba, mulierum puerorumque agminibus immixta*, in 30, 33, 12 the text according to M. Müller, reads *inter immixtos alienigenas*, and the variants are *mixtos alienigenis*. *Agminibus* is better regarded as a dative, and the text of M. M. is to be explained by supplying *popularibus* with *immixtos*. It should be noted that *agmini* is used in 10, 20, 12 with *intermixti*, in 24, 31, 3 with *miscendi eos*, and in Curt. 8, 12, 7 with *immixti*, and to explain *agminibus* as an ablative, as Fügner and Luterbacher do, is to disregard the meaning (personal) of this word and at the same time the force of the prefix *in*. The same line of reasoning is to be applied to 30 33, 12, if *alienigenis* is the correct reading (so Zingerle and others).

Namque before *Consonants*: this usage is found as early as Liv. Andr. frg. 22 (B.). To Neue II³, p. 977 and Antib¹. add: Sall. Cat. 36, 5, Cic. Tusc. 3, 44; 65, N. D. 2, 109, Phil. 13, 45, and poet. frg., p. 308 (B.). For the use of *namque* in parenthesis Draeger II², p. 163 cites only one passage in Livy (3, 44, 6), but 9 are to be found in this writer. Cf. Lease, Livy, Intr., p. 39 for Livy's use of parenthesis. To Schmalz Synt³, p. 223 add: Nepos Alc. 1, 2, Eum. 4, 4. From a psychological and stylistic point of view it is interesting to note that some writers, as Cato Agr., Varro R. R., Celsus, Plin. Min., do not use *namque* at all, in others it is not at all common, Cicero (Rhet., Or., Phil.) using it only 35 times, Caesar only 10, and in still others it is a word of frequent occurrence, Nepos using it 64 times, Val. Max. 66, Quint. 65, and Tacitus 51. According to the Antib¹. (= 6th Ed.!) Tacitus uses *namque* only 3 times in second place, and in the first only before a consonant. Cf. also Ann. 2, 43, 22. In the first place he uses it 50 times, and of these only 18 precede a consonant! Furthermore, 'the first example of its post-position in Prose' is not in Varro L. L., but in Cinc. Alimentus (Funaioli, Gram. Rom. Frg. I, p. 2).

Nec = ne . . quidem: to Schmalz Stil³, p. 40 and Draeger II², p. 73 add: Lucr. 1, 1115; 5, 314; 6, 1214, Livy 3, 52, 9; 6, 15, 7, Luc. Phars. 8, 497, Quint. 9, 2, 67, Juv. 13, 97, and particularly Martial in whom this usage is found at least 20 times (1, 109, 20; 113, 2; 3, 2, 12; 4, 44, 8; 6, 3, 4, etc., and *sed nec* 2, 28, 3; 4, 82, 5; 5, 44, 4; 9, 48, 10; 12, 97, 8).¹ *Nec non et*: the Antib¹. refers to Archiv 8, p. 181; for additional occurrences see Lease, Archiv 10, p. 390 and A. J. P. XXI (1901), p. 452. This formula was more widely used by Vergil than by Ovid, but these writers and all others are eclipsed by Plin. Mai. in fondness for

Intermiscere, found only in perf. part.: *agmini* 10, 20, 12, *hostibus* 10, 20, 8, *turmis* 42, 58, 6, and: *intermiscendo dignis* 4, 56, 3.

Permiscere, also only in perf. part.: *senatui* 21, 14, 1, *turbæ* 30, 18, 7, *manipulis* 8, 6, 16, *hostibus* 31, 24, 16, *fugientibus* 26, 44, 4 (Caes., B. G. 7, 62, 9 uses *cum f.*), *feminis* 39, 13, 10 and *ploratibus* 38, 22, 8, probably abl. (cf. 2, 33, 8 *mixtus ploratu*). In 27, 35, 10 *permixtae* = *finitimae*. This verb is also used twice with *cum*, 32, 18, 8 *fugientibus* (contrast 26, 44, 4 above) and 30, 10, 15 *navibus*.

¹ To the "literature" cited in the Antib¹. add: Nägelsb.-Müller Stil³, p. 771, Kirk, Studies in Honor of B. L. Gildersleeve, p. 31 f. and Langen to Val. Flacc. 4, 200.

this connective, using it at least 36 times.¹ For *neque* (*nec*) *enim* in Silver Latin cf. Lease, *Class. Rev.* 16 (1902), p. 212 and add the following:

	Neque enim.	Nec enim.
Cicero Rhet	36	11
Cicero Epist.....	47	22
Seneca Epist.....	16	8
Pliny Epist.....	72	0
Livy.....	54	18

Necesse est ut: both Dahl, *Lat. Part. ut*, p. 249 and Schmalz *Anm.* 482 to Reisig-H. Vorles. cite Sen. Ep. 78, 16 (= 78, 17 Hense), but here the text has been emended. To the passages cited add: Sen. Suas. 6, 10, Sen. N. Q. 2, 142 (G.), Quint. 5, 10, 123 (R.), Veget. pp. 16, 14; 24, 18 (Lang), Macr. 1, 17, 3; 6, 8, 6, Somn. Scip. 2, 14, 6; 21, Lact. 1, 3, 16; 2, 11, 8; 3, 12, 7; 9, 11; 18, 2; 24, 8; 7, 15, 11, Ira D., 1, 15, 7; 16, 3, Ambros. Off. 1, 87; 2, 41, Aug. C. D. 13, 18; 14, 26; 16, 1; 17, 26; 21, 3 (bis), Conf. 1, 11; 10, 16 (Kn.); Script. Hist. Aug. 18, 49, 1; 20, 25, 4; Servius to Aen. 4, 102; 6, 839. For *necesse habeo* in Quintilian cf. Bonnell, *Lex.* and add 7, 2, 16.

Nescire with infin.: add to Draeger II³, p. 304, Plin. Min. 5, 11, 3 *nescit stare* and to the top of p. 372, where no passage is cited in prose for *nescius*, Livy 27, 7, 5; 43, 13, 1 (the *Antib*⁷. under *nescire* cites Quint. 8, 4, 28, but this is a quotation from Cicero).

Neve and *Neu*: for a detailed discussion of these two forms in general and in Livy in particular, together with their syntactical usage in that writer, cf. Lease, *Class. Phil.* 3 (1908), pp. 302-315. Particular attention is called to the statement on p. 312 and to two passages of the correlative use of *ut neve . . . neve*, Cic. De Or. 3, 171 and 172 (omitted by Draeger II², p. 695), in the latter of which are found two *verbs*, a usage thought to be non-existent in Latin by Bennett, *Critique*, p. 29.

¹ The *Archiv* 8, p. 181 incorrectly cites 29, 22 and omits: 2, 63; 3, 144; 6, 79; 142; 7, 78; 8, 219; 12, 34; 72; 13, 72; 14, 121; 15, 39; 16, 15; 29; 135; 245; 17, 56; 133; 244; 266; 18, 365; 19, 63; 20, 87; 21, 61; 26, 147; 28, 251; 31, 79; 111; 32, 110; 33, 23; 36, 161; 165. Plin. Mai., therefore, uses this formula the unusually large number of 36 times. Add also Suet. Cal. 40, Vesp. 18, Macr. 1, 9, 2; 4, 6, 10; 6, 4, 23; 7, 2, 6, and Char., p. 135, 20 = G. R. Frag. I, p. 484 (Funaioli).

Nolo ut: according to the Antib¹, 'probably only in Hygin. fab. 189, 9', but also found in Firm. Mat. De Err. Prof. Rel. 8, 3 (p. 24, 182).

Pacisci ut: this construction, as also with an infin., first appears in prose in Livy, according to Draeger II², p. 248 and 319. In Livy *pacisci ut* is used 17 times, *ne* twice (37, 32, 10; 38, 24, 4), infin. once (21, 41, 9), acc. and infin. once (34, 23, 7). *Pacisci ut* is also found 3 times in Val. Max., once in Mela, twice in Plin. Min., once in Justin, 3 times in Suet., twice in Gell.¹

Plenus: for Livy's usage reference is often made to Drak. note to 3, 25, 6 (e. g., by Draeger I², p. 559, Luterbacher to Livy 5, 21, 10; 7, 28, 7). Here, however, Drak. cites only passages from the 1st decade. Accordingly, reference should also be made to his note at 27, 40, 8 (23, 12, 14; 27, 40, 8; 35, 32, 12 are omitted). In Livy, therefore, *plenus* is used with the genitive about 50 times, with the ablative only 9. Note also the use of the abl. in Ovid Am. 2, 6, 13, Rem. Am. 180, Front. Str. 4, 7, 9; 10, Oros. 7, 13, 2. Cf. further Lease, A. J. P. XXI (1904), p. 450.

Pluere: with this verb Livy prefers the abl. (used 29 times to the acc. (only 4); cf. Lease to Livy 21, l. 1902, and H. J. Müller to 24, 10, 7 (Anh², p. 100). Of a shower of stones Livy uses *lapides pluere* 15 times, *lapidari* 3 times (29, 10, 4; 14, 4; 44, 18, 6), *lapides cadere* in 1, 31, 2; 22, 1, 9; 41, 9, 4, besides *imbri lapidavit* 43, 13, 4 and *pluit lapideo imbri* 30, 38, 8.

Postquam: according to the Antib¹. "Cicero bevorzugt offenbar *posteaquam*, wie ein Blick in das Lexicon von Merguet zeigt". "Das Lexicon" implies that there is only one. While that to the *speeches* does show such a preference, *posteaquam* being used 94 times, *postquam* only 19; the Lex. Phil. shows the contrary, *postquam* being used 9 times, the other not at all. In his rhetorical works, also, there is no decided preference, *posteaquam* being used 6 times, *postquam* 5. As a matter of fact, Cicero in his Speeches and Letters² greatly prefers *posteaquam*, but not in his Rhet. and Phil. works. In Caesar (Meusel Lex.) *posteaquam* is used 13 times, *postquam* 10. Sallust (Cat., Jug.), Nepos, and

¹ Add to Draeger II², p. 248, Livy 8, 36, 11; 9, 42, 7; 10, 37, 5; 46, 11; 22, 52, 3; 23, 15, 3; 24, 47, 8; 31, 17, 3; 45, 6; 32, 25, 9; 36, 9; 35, 51, 8; 38, 9, 9, Val. Max. 5, 4 ext. 3; 6, 1, 10; 7, 4, ext. 1, Mela 1, 38, Plin. Min. 6, 23, 2; Pan. 67, 7 (without *ut* 3, 12, 1), Just. 16, 4, 7, Suet. Caes. 9, 3; 19, 1; 29 (Ihm), Gell. 6, 18, 2. Cf. also Quint. Decl., pp. 321, 28; 356, 7 (R.).

² Cf. R. B. Steele, A. J. P. XXVIII (1907), p. 435 f.

Livy, however, all show a marked preference for *postquam* (65-1, 27-9, 372-3). Val. Max. and Plin. Min., it may be noted, use *postquam* frequently, but *posteaquam* not at all. In Cicero these forms are used with the perf. 106 times, the pres. 5, and in Livy with the perf. 258, the pres. 4 (6, 8, 10; 21, 13, 4; 23, 17, 4; 34, 19, 10), with the impf. 80, the plupf. 28.

Potiri: this verb is found with three cases in Plautus, with the abl. 3 times (Asin. 916, Curc. 173, Ps. 1071, and Arg. II 15), the acc. 3 times (Asin. 323, Most. 415, Rud. 190), the gen. 8 times (Am. 187, Asin. 555, Capt. 92, 144, 762, Ep. 532, 562, Rud. 1337). Note also the accus. in Caecil. St. 109 (R.), Lucr. 2, 659; 3, 1038; 4, 760.

Praeterquam: Livy's usage of this particle differs from that of Cicero: Cicero (Or. et Phil.) uses it only 10 times, but Livy uses it 96 times; in Cicero there is no preference for its use with *quod* (used 5 times), but in Livy it is so used 60 times out of 96. (Cf. Lease to Livy I, l. 1149).

Priusquam: here again Livy's usage differs from that of Cicero; Cicero prefers *antequam*, using it 213 times (Rhet. 15, Or. 83, Phil. 54, Ep. 61), to *priusquam*, used 112 times (Rhet. 7, Or. 45, Ph. 25, Ep. 35), but Livy prefers *priusquam* (as Sallust), using it 308 times, to *antequam*, 113 times. So also Nepos prefers *priusquam* (using it 25 times) to *antequam*, used not at all; Velleius, however, uses *antequam* 22 times and *priusquam* only twice (1, 10, 2; 2, 24, 23), and Tacitus, *antequam* 38 times, *priusquam* only 6. *Priusquam ut* is extremely rare, being found, as far as I know, only in Cic. Att. 4, 1, 1; 8, 11 (D.), 5, Lig. 34, Livy 26, 26, 7; 31, 11, 16; 35, 11, 5; 40, 47, 7 and Macr. 7, 8, 8.

Procul: according to the Antib¹. Livy often uses *procul a domo*; in the passage cited, however, as also in 23, 12, 3; 28, 12, 3; 37, 18, 2 and 40, 38, 2, *procul ab domo* is used. Livy is conspicuous in his fondness for *procul* as a preposition, using it in all 65 times (24-23-16-2),¹ but with *ab* only 40. *Procul dubio* is not "erst Suet. und Quint.", as Reisig Vorles. p. 735 stated, nor "erst Plin. Nat. 9, 184 und Liv. 39, 40, 10", as the Antib¹. maintains. Reisig had evidently overlooked Hand IV, p. 594, where Lucr. 1, 812 and Livy 39, 40, 10 are cited. As a matter of fact, the expression is found as early as Cato (cf. Gell. 3, 7, 6),

¹ Neue II³, p. 771 cites only 17 occurrences in Livy, and omits the usage of Val. Max. (7), Curtius (8), and 10 passages in Tacitus, 4 in Ovid.

Ennius (cf. Cic. Fam. 7, 6, 1), Accius (cf. Gell. 3, 11, 5), Hyginus (cf. Gell. 10, 16, 18), and later in Val. Max. 1, 5, 5; 3, 2, 9; 5, 2, 5; 7; 6, 2, 5; 9, 4 ext. 1; 9, 7 Mil. 1. It is not found "erst in Plin. Nat. 9, 184", but in 2, 165, later in 17, 86; cf. further Lease, A. J. P. XXI, p. 451.

Prohibere aliquem aliqua re: for Livy's usage the Antib¹ refers to "Fabri zu 22, 14, 2". To the list of 4 here given add: 1, 49, 1; 7, 4, 4; 25, 13; 27, 12, 10. For this verb with a passive infin. "M. Müller zu 2. 34, 11" is referred to; to his list of 17 add 6, 24, 9. Livy in 26, 40, 4 uses *quin* after *nec poterat*, in 25, 35, 6 he uses *quominus* after *non posset*. With *ne*: to Draeger II, p. 294 add Livy 24, 43, 4; 38, 56, 13.

Quamquam: while in Caesar and Nepos *etsi* is the favorite concessive particle, and in Sallust not used at all,¹ *quamquam* is the most common in Cicero's Speeches and Rhet. Works,² in Livy (124 times: 32-50-29-13) and Quintilian (124).³ *Quamquam* with Subjunctive: neither Draeger II², p. 768 nor Kühnast, p. 244 cite Livy 38, 9, 11; 57, 8 (cf. H. J. M. *ad loc.*, 3rd ed., 1907). Plin. Mai. 14, 24 and Suet. Caes. 70, Gram. 21 use *quamquam* with an abl. abs., and Plin. Mai. 19, 67; 28, 114; 29, 80; 36, 62 uses it with a pres. part. Cf. further A. J. P. XXI, p. 453.

Quamvis with impf. subj.: found in Cicero, as Brut. 174, Fam. 7, 32, 3, Att. 12, 23, 1, and Sall. Or. Macr. 20, the Aug. poets and late, as Aug. Conf. 4, 6; 6, 4; 10, 15 (Kn.), Oros. 6, 8, 9; 11, 24; 7, 3, 9; with plpf. sub., Verg. Ecl. 6, 50, Plin. Mai. 33, 135, Sen. Ep. 76, 26, and at least 9 times in Orosius; cf. further A. J. P. XXI, p. 453. For its use with the indic. cf. Draeger II², p. 770 and add: Val. Max. 2, 2, 7, Celsus 33, 6; 82, 9, etc., Sen. Brev. Vit. 6, 4, Lucan 3, 748, Petron. 58. With the superl., also found in Val. Max. 8, 15 pr., Suet. Dom. 14, 3; with abl. abs., in Ovid Rem. Am. 793, Plin. Mai. 11, 6; 17, 8, Lucan 5, 811, Suet. Caes. 48, and with the pres. part. in Plin. Mai. 11, 270.

Que: for *que . . . que* cf. Draeger II², p. 80. Here, however, Liv. 26, 57 is cited for 26, 51, and the following are omitted: Liv. 26, 33, 15, Sen. Clem. 1, 6, 5; 2, 1, 3, Macr. 5, 22, 10, Som. Scip. 1, 14, 6; 16, 9. Note Livy's addition of *que* to final *ē*

¹ Reisch-H. Vorles., p. 268, Anm. 427, b.

² Cic. Rhet. has *quamquam* 65 times, *etsi* 24 times.

³ Quintilian uses *quamquam* 124 times, *quamvis* 31, and *etsi* 8.

in *morteque* 8, 9, 7 and possibly in *tabeque* 21, 39, 2 (cf. Neue I³, p. 374). The use of *que* at the end of a period, avoided by Cic. and Caes., but found in Sall. Cat. 5, 1; 15, 1, Jug. 4, 9, is a characteristic feature in Livy's style (about 25 in the 3d decade alone), and was observed also in Plin. Mai. 33, 103, Sen. Ep. 66, 10, Plin. Min. (16 times), Front. Str. (6 times).

Quin, with a Command in *O. O.*: add to the two passages in Livy cited by the Antib⁷. 38, 43, 8; 39, 32, 11; 40, 40, 4. *Quin*, consecutive, is used, much more frequently (94) than *quominus* (38).¹ *Non quin* was used twice by Livy, 2, 15, 2; 32, 32, 6.² *Quin*, interrogative, was used 20 times by Livy, 5 in *O. O.*, 14 with pres. indic. (8 in 1st dec.), one with fut. pf. (1, 45, 6); *quin*, corroborative, 28 times, alone 15 (10-3-2-0), + *etiam* 6 (only in 1st dec.), + *contra* 5 (6, 37, 8; 7, 5, 1; 31, 31, 9; 35, 26, 10; 37, 15, 3), + *potius* twice (22, 41, 4; 26, 19, 8), and with *et* not at all. *Quin et*, however, was preferred by Val. Max., decidedly so by Plin. Mai. and Tacitus, but used only once by Quint. (3, 8, 14). *Quin immo* was used 12 times by Plin. Mai. (14, 34; 15, 7, etc., and *quin immo etiam* in 37, 17; 197), by Quint. 6 times (cf. Bonnell, Lex.), and by Plin. Min. 5 (1, 8, 4; 2, 11, 11; 3, 16, 4; 7, 23, 1, Pan. 69, 5). Note *quin . . non* Cic. Att. 5, 11, 6; 8, 11, D. 3, Cels. 109, 17 (D.).

Quisquam, with things: according to the Antib⁷. 'already in Lucr., cf. Holze, p. 111'. Two objections can be found to this statement, the first being that the reference should be to Holze I, p. 402, the second, that the usage is found earlier, in Plautus (Men. 447, Most. 608). To Draeger I², p. 99 add: Quint. 4, 1, 10; 10, 7, 3.

Quisque in plural: cf. Antib⁷, but note that this usage is not found "Zuerst bei rhet. Her.", but in Plaut. Most. 155. To M. Müller, Livy I², p. 173, add for Masc. and Fem. plur. to the one cited, 10, 35, 8; 37, 43, 8, Masc., and 25, 22, 8; 26, 45, 2; 39, 31, 12 Fem.

Recusare with the infin.: according to the Antib⁷. never found in Cicero, but there is at least one example, Ad Att. 1, 8, 1 (cited by Draeger II², p. 336!). Add to Draeger, p. 336: Plin. Ep. 4, 17, 11; 9, 13, 2, on p. 692: *non recusare quominus* Val. Max. 8, 1 Abs. 10. In Livy *recusare* is followed by *quin* 5 times (to

¹ Draeger II⁷, pp. 670 and 691 cites only 33 occurrences of *quin* and 24 of *quominus*.

² Omitted by Stegmann, N. Jahrb., 1887, p. 263.

Dr. II¹, p. 671 add 29, 18, 9; 30, 30, 25; 32, 21, 15; 42, 42, 3), by *quominus* 3 times (add to Id., p. 691: 43, 16, 12).

Refert: found in Quintilian 37 times,¹ *interest* 25 times, but in Pliny the Younger *interest* is used 21 times, *refert* 15 times. Note the use of *parvi refert* in Quint. 1, 4, 21 and add to Draeger I², p. 465. The remaining uses of the genitive in Quint. are 9, 44, 4 *compositionis*, and twice of persons (8, 6, 58; 12, 8, 2). In Pliny there are but two occurrences of the gen. with *refert*, 8, 22, 4 and Pan. 40, 5, both of things. With *interest* Quint. uses the gen. 3 times (of things 7, 2, 20; 10, 1, 11, of persons 3, 6, 2), Pliny 7 times (of things 9, 13, 25; 10, 98, 2, Pan. 21, 3; 60, 3, of persons 5, 21, 2; 6, 3, 2; Pan. 65, 2). The ablat. *mea*, etc., as in Cicero, is more common with *interest* than with *refert*: in these two authors, however, only *interest* is so used, in Quint. once (7, 4, 10) with *sua*, in Pliny 5 times (2, 1, 14; 5, 1, 13; 6, 6, 8; 7, 20, 6, Pan. 84, 4). Note that Pliny in 1, 23, 1 uses *plurimum refert*, a few lines below, *plurimum interest*, followed in each case by exactly the same words.

Studere: in Plautus this verb is used 23 times, 11 with the dative, twice with accus. (Mil. 1437, Truc. 337), 5 with the infin. (Am. 182, Asin. 281, Bacch. 1161, Poen. 818, Ps. 523), 3 with accus. and infin. (Am. 892, Asin. 67, Stich. 52), and twice with *ut* (Capt. Arg. 4, Poen. 575). It is to be noted that the Antib¹. cites Plaut. Asin. 167 for the use of the dative of the gerund. Plautus, however, uses only the gerundive construction with this verb, Merc. 192, Stich. 678 (in Asin. 67 the acc. and infin. is used).

Suadere with infin.: to the list in Draeger II², p. 324 add: Auct. Her. 3, 8, Quint. 2, 7, 2; 6, 3, 92; 11, 2, 49.

Subinde: according to the Antib¹., 'first in prose in Livy, then Suet.': cf., however, Val. Max. 5, 4 ext. 5, Celsus, p. 100, 5 (D.), Sen. N. Q. 6, 32, 12, Ben. 7, 21, 2, Prov. 4, 9, Ep. 13, 13, (in Ep., at least 20 times), Curt. 7, 7, 30; Col. 2, 4, 11; 6, 30, 2; 11, 2, 8, Mela 3, 47; 102, Plin. Mai. Pr. 28; 11, 81; 144; 34, 120, Quint. 6, 3, 85; 8, 3, 58; 9, 3, 27; 11, 1, 17; 2, 24; 135, Tac. Agr. 14, Plin. Min. 2, 76.

Temperare with a dative: Seyffert and Heräus, according to the Antib¹., each maintained that this construction appeared first in Livy. Drakenborch to Livy 28, 44, 18, however, already called

¹ Under *refert* Bonnell, Lex. omits 1, 10, 40; 3, 8, 48; 4, 2, 116; 7, 2, 14; 8, 6, 24; 9, 1, 17 (5, 12, 17 is cited for 5, 12, 7), under *interest*: 2, 10, 9; 4, 2, 79; 7, 2, 14 and 10, 5, 13.

attention to its appearance in Plautus Rud. 1254. He also uses it in Truc. 61 (elsewhere, Plautus uses the abl. (Merc. 982), *ne* (Stich. 117), the infin. (Poen. 22, 33, 1036) and absolute 3 times.

Ubi primum: though avoided by Cicero and Nepos, it is the favorite with Sallust and Caesar (Archiv 14 (1905), p. 239). It was regarded with favor by Livy also, another departure from the Ciceronian norm, being used 30 times, to *cum primum* 14 and *ut pr.* only 5 (7, 6, 11; 25, 26, 13; 36, 19, 3; 41, 2, 1; 42, 1, 8). On the other hand, Pliny the younger does not use *ubi primum* at all, but *ut pr.* 7 times (1, 9, 7; 3, 6, 6; 6, 6, 5; 8, 3, 2; 9, 16, 2; 10, 3, 1; 9, 1).

Ut qui: According to Draeger II², p. 537 *ut qui* was used 18 times by Livy, but, as a matter of fact it was used 36 times, *quippe qui* 28 times. Cf. Lease to Livy, Praef., l. 3.

Velle ut: found as early as Plautus (Bacch. 989a). This passage, as also Cic. De Or. 3, 228, Sulla 1, Phil. 8, 31, Fam. 4, 14, 4, and Firm. Mat. De Err. Prof. Rel. 19, 2 (p. 47, Z.) and Aug. Conf. 9, 4 (Kn.), is omitted by Draeger II², p. 255. The paratactic construction is found in Pliny the Younger as follows: after *volo*, pres. subj. in 7, 9, 8 (*bis*); after *velim* pres. subj. in 3, 19, 9; 5, 12, 4; 6, 8, 8; 8, 24, 10; after *vellem*, the impf. subj. in 4, 15, 8; the plupf. in 6, 34, 3.

Veri similis: the Antib⁷. should have cited Landgraf's note to Reisig-H., Vorles., p. 621. Here, however, *similia veris* is incorrectly cited for Livy 6, 20, 4 (6, 12, 4 = *simile veri*), and so, also, Livy 29, 21, 1 for 29, 20, 1. For *veri similis*, he, as also M. Mueller, Livy II, p. 150 says, "2 mal": the expression is found 3 times (5, 11, 7; 9, 37, 7; 38, 55, 9). Furthermore, *similia veris* is also found in Livy 5, 21, 9.

In Quintilian *simile veri* is used 12 times (Haustein, p. 39 f. omits 2, 17, 39 (*bis*), 4, 2, 31 (*bis*), 8, 3, 70 and cites 2, 17, 19 for 2, 17, 39), *simile vero* but once (2, 4, 2). Cf. also, for the latter, Plin. N. H. 16, 220.

Versa vice (instead of the modern form, which appears first in Isidorus, Archiv 5, p. 587), is found, according to the Antib⁷, 'first in Sen., then in Gell.': cf., however, Justin 13, 1, 7; 16, 4, 18. Note its use also in Oros. 1, 14, 2; 2, 10, 3; 3, 20, 9; 5, 7, 10 and 6, 3, 3.

EMORY B. LEASE.

THE COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.